



As to Petitioner's first motion, the letter of the Eleventh Circuit Clerk advised Petitioner that his first Notice of Appeal (Doc. 61) was "filed before the disposition of a timely tolling motion" and that the "effectiveness of the notice is suspended until the motion(s) is/are disposed of." The Eleventh Circuit Clerk was merely informing Petitioner that his Notice of Appeal would not be effective until this Court ruled on his motions for reconsideration. Petitioner's instant motion is therefore **DENIED AS MOOT**.

Petitioner's second motion appears to be in the nature of yet another motion for reconsideration. Although largely nonsensical, Petitioner's motion clearly advances no basis for this Court to reconsider its dismissal of Petitioner's habeas action. Accordingly, said motion is **DENIED**.

As to Petitioner's last two motions, the Court in its June 21<sup>st</sup> Order determined that Petitioner is not entitled to a COA from said Order. Moreover, for the reasons stated in this Court's June 21<sup>st</sup> Order, the Court finds that Petitioner does not have a non-frivolous issue for appeal as required for leave to proceed IFP. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). Accordingly, Petitioner's motions for a COA and to proceed IFP are hereby **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED**, this 26th day of July, 2013.

S/ C. Ashley Royal  
C. ASHLEY ROYAL  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

cr